

Quality Data Model (QDM) User Group Meeting | AGENDA/MEETING MINUTES

Participants: Balasubramanyam, Balu; Barnes, Itara; Barton, Cynthia; Boxwala, Aziz; Bregman, Howard; Carroll, John; Dardis, Michelle; Hall, Deb; Hu, Yanyan; Jenny, Peggy; Jouza, Jamie; Kennedy, Rosemary; Kunisch, Joseph; Lipscomb, Suzannah; Ludwig, Allison; Martins, Rute; McClure, Rob; McKay, Patti; Moesel, Chris; Rankins, Stan; Skapik, Julia; Shoemaker, Mike; Smith, Anne; Stephens, Judi; Sturges, Artrina; Warren, Judith

Meeting date | 8/20/2014 2:30 PM EDT | Meeting location | Webinar video link: <https://www4.gotomeeting.com/register/537598175>

Agenda Item	Time/Presenter	Objective	Discussion/Options/Decisions	Comm*
Participants	2:30 / Balu	Welcome participants		
July 23 Meeting Minute Review	2:30 / Chris	Review discussion, decisions, and action items from previous meeting	<p>Follow-up activities resulting from the last User Group Meeting were shared.</p> <p>Since the last User Group meeting, a summary of the issue of <u>QDM 48</u> was distributed and discussed via email. There is an opportunity today to further discuss the outstanding comments.</p> <p><u>QDM 69</u>, <u>QDM 70</u>, <u>QDM 72</u> have been approved by the MAT Change Control Board (MCCB). These changes will be captured in the next version of the QDM, version 4.1.1 set to release in September. The plan is to implement the changes in the MAT concurrently.</p> <p><u>QDM 68</u> will be revisited today. To support discussion, a list of relationship types was previously sent and feedback from the e-governance group was solicited.</p>	
QDM Issue Review	2:35 / Chris	<u>QDM-88</u> : Overlaps require end dates	<p>The overlap operator was originally introduced in QDM 4.0. and has led to confusion as “no end date” arrives at different conclusions when using “overlaps” versus the more complex logic it was intended to replace.</p> <p>The interpretation of “no end date” was discussed as whether it should be considered “ongoing”. Additionally, it was noted that to accomplish a “point in time” activity, there would need to be a start and end time to represent the timing. Thus, to make the distinction for something to have ended vs. something that hasn’t ended, effective time has to be consistently populated.</p> <p>The User Group noted that this is a difficult issue as this logic occurs several times throughout Meaningful Use measures. The User Group also suggested assessing the original intent of “overlaps”, and if it isn’t representing what it was originally designed to represent, it is partially negating its purpose.</p>	

Agenda Item	Time/Presenter	Objective	Discussion/Options/Decisions	Comm*
			<p>The User Group recommends continuing with overlaps supporting missing end dates. Missing end dates would be interpreted as an event that is ongoing. However, guidance or warning of this calculation should be clearly stated since it is inconsistent with other operators (e.g., during). This approach matches the original intent of overlaps.</p> <p>This issue and information will be brought to Tuesday's Standards call. If they agree, the QDM Management team will send final email to the User Group for review. Following consensus, Bonnie will be updated to reflect the preference of the User Group.</p>	
	2:55 / Chris	<u>CQM-342</u> : Are cancelled medications considered "ordered"?	<p>The User Group reviewed a scenario about a medication ordered but then cancelled before the prescription is filled, and whether that medication should still be considered an order.</p> <p>The User Group reached consensus that a cancelled medication order is still considered "ordered".</p>	
	3:15 / Chris	<u>CQM-615</u> : Patient Characteristic: Gestational Age	<p>A problem representing gestational age was noted, specifically that the value set ECQMs were using to specify gestational age (greater than 37 weeks) clashed with the QRDA which required a fixed value set plus a physical quantity (quantity and unit).</p> <p>There was a short term solution shared in April that required the use of "Physical Exam, Performed: Estimated Gestational Age at Delivery (result >= 37 week(s)). A longer-term solution requires an update to the QRDA template to use "estimated date of confinement", an investigation of related efforts, and updates to the QDM and downstream specifications to "include the right attributes".</p> <p>The User Group discussed the calculation of the gestational age and its difficulty in doing so via an EHR, as there is a challenge in the logic presented.</p> <p>The User Group recommended tabling this issue for now. ONC will bring to bring to Dr. Elliott Main to gain resolution on the use of estimated date of confinement. Additionally, ONC will explore the opportunity of a task force to obtain a longer-term solution.</p>	
	3:35 / Chris	<u>QDM-68</u> : Consider adding support for the additional relationships to the QDM	A list of ActRelationshipTypes (non-timing relationships) was presented to the User Group to determine which could potentially be used in the QDM in the	

Agenda Item	Time/Presenter	Objective	Discussion/Options/Decisions	Comm*
			<p>future. The list and the relationship's definitions are maintained by HL7 and has been previously shared with the User Group.</p> <p>Discussion noted the need to think about what is needed from EHR's, what data/linkages exists, and understand what each of the relationship types mean.</p> <p>Relationships of interest included "episodeLink" and "has component". The QDM Management team will delve deeper into these relationships, determine their applicability, value, and the feasibility of data. Information will be brought back to the User Group.</p>	
	3:50 / Chris	<u>QDM-55</u> : Representing patient location at the time of death	<p>Currently the date/time and cause of death are captured. Discussion centered around the value of adding "location" of a patient's death.</p> <p>It was discussed that "level of care" may be more useful compared to "location" of death. This would allow for assessment of the types of care (e.g., ICU, ED, Clinic) patients were receiving when they passed away and may be more useful knowledge for future activities. It was cautioned that there needs to be clarity around the definition of "level of care".</p> <p>There was a question of the utility of "level of care" beyond measurement, and it was noted that this element could support the anticipated future needs of measurement, specifically around measures related to all-cause mortality.</p> <p>The QDM Management team will send questions to Debbie Krause on what would be needed to support this element, and will also obtain feedback on what the exact wording (level of care, type of care at death) should be, to avoid future confusion.</p>	
	4:05 / Chris	<u>QDM-48</u> : Need a new standard element to represent the concept of a provider receiving a referral request	<p>In follow-up to a previous User Group discussion regarding "closing the referral loop" measures, discussion centered on sending referrals and receiving referrals, with addition of a direction attribute.</p> <p>It was previously noted in past meetings and again today, that the notion of directionality may be useful to other measures and concepts beyond "referral loop", to include transition of care measures, care plans, etc. This idea to develop a more general solution with directional attributes for both sent and received codes could apply to additional orders in EHRs.</p> <p>Additionally, it was noted that directionality for referrals has utility beyond quality measurement, as there are requirements to transmit referrals more broadly.</p>	

Agenda Item	Time/Presenter	Objective	Discussion/Options/Decisions	Comm*
			The User Group will continue to discuss this issue. The QDM Management group will also bring this issue to the eMIG for further vendor input.	
Next steps	4:25	Conclusion	Call concluded at 4:30. Next QDM User Group meeting will be held September 24 from 2:30-4:30.	

Action Items	Assigned To	Due Date	Status
<u>QDM-88</u> : Bring issue and information to Standards Meeting (8/26)	QDM Management Team	8/26	In progress
<u>CQM-615</u> : Share with Dr .Elliot Main to obtain resolution on the estimated date of confinement. ONC will explore the opportunity of a task force to obtain a longer term solution.	ONC	September User Group Meeting	In progress
<u>QDM-68</u> : Research applicability, value, and the feasibility of “episodeLink” and “has component”.	QDM Management Team	September User Group Meeting	In progress
<u>QDM-55</u> : Work with Debbie Krause to support “level of care” during time of death.	QDM Management Team	September User Group Meeting	In progress
<u>QDM-48</u> : Bring issue and information to eMIG for further input from vendors.	QDM Management Team	September User Group Meeting	In progress